

| | | | |
|---|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 09/704,073 | HAUDUC ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Wen-Tai Lin | 2154 | |

All Participants:
Status of Application: After Final

 (1) Wen-Tai Lin.

(3) _____.

 (2) Rajiv Sarathy.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 7 March 2005
Time: 4:00 pm
Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

11, 20 and 26

Prior art documents discussed:

See Continuation Sheet
Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Identification of prior art discussed: The examiner indicated that: (1) Applicant's argument was persuasive; (2) claim 11 was in condition for allowance; and (3) recommended further limitation on claims 20 and 26. Applicant's representative made proposed amendment on March 7, 2005 and the examiner agreed to incorporate the changes into the examiner's amendment. .